

REMARKS

Initially, Applicants note that the remarks and amendments made by this paper are consistent with the proposals presented to the Examiner during the telephone call of November 16, 2007.

By this paper, claims 8, 11, 24 and 28 have been amended; claim 31 and 32 have been added, while claims 1-7 and 14-23 were previously canceled. Claims 8-13 and 24-32 are now pending, of which claims 8 and 24 are the only independent claims at issue.¹

The Office Action mailed October 19, 2007 considered and rejected claims 8-13 and 24-30. Claims 8-12 and 24-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cragun et al. (U.S. Patent 5,973,683), hereinafter Cragun and further in view of Farley et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0233651), hereinafter Farley, and Goddard (U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0123135), hereinafter Goddard. Claims 13 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cragun, Farley, Goddard, and further in view of Iverson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,938,005), hereinafter Iverson.²

As recited in the claims, Applicants claimed invention is generally directed to controlling access to a directory associated with entertainment content. Claim 8, for example, recites a method of controlling a user's access to a directory associated with particular entertainment content using a security group particular to the entertainment content. In the method, the particular entertainment content is executed by the entertainment system. In response to the execution, a security group for the entertainment content is created. The security group is then stored in association with the particular entertainment content. The directories associated with the entertainment content then have a full access deny applied to them based, the full access deny being associated with the security group. An entertainment content definition file that defines a rating level and one or more content descriptors for the particular entertainment content and user access settings for a particular user that define a rating level and one or more content descriptors, and an updatable rating definition file that defines a rating hierarchy and content descriptors for one or more levels within the rating hierarchy are then read. Based on the hierarchy defined in

¹ Support for the new amendments is found throughout the Application, including, but not limited to the disclosure found on pages 12, 13 and 25 of the Application (as originally filed).

² Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

the rating definition file, the rating level and content descriptors for the particular entertainment content are compared to the rating level and content descriptors for the particular user to determine if the user is authorized access to the particular entertainment content. If the particular user is not allowed to access the particular entertainment content, the particular user is added as a member of the security group. After the security group has been created, access is denied to the directory associated with the particular entertainment content based on the security group created for the particular entertainment content and the full access deny permission applied to the directory.

Claim 24, the only other independent claim, is directed to a computer program product and storage media corresponding to the method recited in claim 8.

Now, with regard to the substantive rejections of record, it will be noted that independent claim 8, (the only independent method claim) was rejected in view of a combination of references, Cragun, Goddard, and Farley. Cragun discloses a method of controlling content in response to a viewer's profile, accumulated viewing time and at least one content classification source. Embodiments of Goddard teach a method of setting acceptable content rating parameters for filtering content in a ratings-enabled media. Farley is directed to presenting a digital message rated by a propriety scheme so that the digital message can be played on a playback device in accordance with one of the propriety schemes by association of a code with the playback device.

It will be noted, however, that the combination of Cragun, Goddard and Farley clearly fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations present in claim 8. For instance, claim 8 requires creating a security group for the particular entertainment content and denying access to a directory associated with the particular entertainment content for members of the security group in addition to the other claim elements. In the office action, the Examiner has relied upon Goddard as teaching a similar limitation. However, the cited disclosure of Goddard does not teach or suggest that the security group is created and stored is associated with the particular entertainment content or that the security group is denied access to a directory associated with the security group. Instead, Goddard teaches that an authorized user may select a user profile and then select content of the example program that is objectionable for that user.

As recited in paragraph 19 of Goddard, the selection of the content to block merely adjusts parameters of the system to ensure the type of content will be blocked in the future. A

group of blocked users is never saved in Goddard, the only group of users that exists are those users that are created by an application of the rules. An actual representation of the users is never actually stored by the system; instead, Goddard will always require the rules to be applied to determine if content should be blocked. This is contrasted with the present claims, where as soon a user tries to access the directory associated with the content, the system merely references the security group and determines they are blocked without requiring any further content comparisons.

Additionally, the cited art is not directed to protecting directories associated with the entertainment content, which the claims are. The present claims prevent a user from being able to access the directories that store content in association with the entertainment content. For instance, a game may have many images or video clips associated with it that are stored in the gaming directories. With a traditional gaming system the content may be unavailable if the game itself is blocked, but modern game systems and computers may allow users to browse the content and potentially allow access to the underlying files even though the game itself is blocked. The presently claimed invention prohibits this by blocking access to the underlying directories for all users that have parental controls prohibiting access to the game.

The Office Action concedes that Cragun fails to teach the use of security groups and Cragun therefore fails compensate for the failings discussed with regard to Goddard. Farley was cited solely as teaching the use of rating levels and content descriptors and fails to compensate for the inadequacies of the combination of Cragun and Goddard. Iverson was cited solely in the rejection of a dependent claim and only for the proposition that a rating file can be an XML file, and is not applicable to the discussion of the independent claims.

Dependent claims 31 and 32 have been added to further clarify additional aspects of the claimed invention. In particular, claim 31 claims that the execution of the entertainment content refers to the installation of the entertainment content, while claim 32 refers to running the content stored on the system. As an example, claim 31 would be applicable at the time the entertainment content is being installed, while claim 32 would be applicable to running a previously installed game or a legacy game that did not create a security group at the time of installation.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing, as well as for the other reasons presented to the Examiner, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the rejections to the claims are now moot. It

will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at 801-533-9800.

Dated this 3rd day of December, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Rick D. Nydegger', with a stylized flourish at the end.

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
JOHN C. BACCOCH
Registration No. 59,890
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973